

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19243

Goldberg has shown a devotion to the national interest as Secretary of Labor and has not permitted prior affiliations to sway either his actions or his judgment in compiling an unusually energetic and generally effective record.

Indeed the chief criticism, if any, of the Goldberg appointment is that it removes him from a sensitive position in Government at a critical period. Labor-management disputes have grown in number and seriousness, and Goldberg was the administration's key figure in seeking to resolve them in a satisfactory manner.

Frankfurter has had a long and colorful career on the Court. It is ironical that he was regarded as a flaming liberal, fresh from Harvard, when he was appointed in 1939 by Franklin D. Roosevelt and now, upon his retirement, is looked upon as one of the conservatives of the Court.

The source of the irony could arise either from a change in Frankfurter's views or a change in those of the Court. Possibly it is a combination of both, but bears out the old observation that today's liberal is often tomorrow's conservative.

Frankfurter had come to win universal respect as a justice who spoke clearly and forcefully. Goldberg is well equipped to follow in his steps in rendering similar service to the Court and the Nation.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Aug. 30, 1962]

CHANGE ON THE COURT

The obvious thing to say of President Kennedy's appointment of Arthur J. Goldberg to the Supreme Court is that here is another case of political reward. Mr. Goldberg has no previous juridical experience. He is known exclusively as an attorney dealing with labor union matters.

Yet if this yardstick is to be the major criterion in measuring capacities or promise of judges, one could conclude only that the American judicial system is rife with incompetency. The opposite is the case. Most men on Federal benches may have gone there with no previous experience as judges.

Presidents, of either party, do name on basis of politics. But they also have shown a considerable feeling for what lies within a man. There are exceptions, but agree or disagree with judicial histories or opinions, the overwhelming majority of Supreme Court Justices have been men who served well, thoughtfully, and contributed to creation of a spirit of justice.

It is essential that the citizen however disgruntled over Court rulings now, past, or future, keep in mind that out of the heritage of English common law the United States has developed a mass of judicial opinion which in many opinions is the finest example on earth of preservation of the individual's liberty, and application of justice to parties human, corporate, or government. It is a proud record. Those who slur do so pitifully.

Mr. Goldberg is son of a Russian immigrant. He worked from age 12. He put himself through college and won his law degree from Northwestern with high honors. If he has been since 1933 wholly involved with labor law, since elevation to Cabinet as Secretary of Labor he has shown a remarkable catholicity of interests. His skills are manifest; within 72 hours after taking office as Secretary he had to settle, and did settle, a strike. His subsequent negotiation of disputes has been admirable. As a CIO attorney, his record was constructive, in merging major unions, in early detecting Communist dangers and expelling contaminated unions. Before joining Government he was earning \$100,000 a year. This is a man of varied capacity.

Losing Justice Felix Frankfurter will wrench. Early labeled liberal, he had come to be accepted as foremost conservative on the Bench. Some say times changed, not Frankfurter. He was at times professorially theatrical, but his incisiveness was pronounced. If it is said he will be but a footnote in history that is not the judgment here.

Mr. Goldberg is due America's congratulations. Do not count him automatically a liberal justice. The High Court does things to people. Goldberg has the stuff of a competent justice however limited his range heretofore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. PROST, Mr. BARING, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8134) to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10566) to provide for the withdrawal and orderly disposition of mineral interests in certain public lands in Pima County, Ariz.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment to meet at 10 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNOFFICIAL BOYCOTT OF CUBA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News carried an article this afternoon entitled "U.S. Aid Pressing Italian Government To Force Striking Seamen To Sail Supply Ships to Castro, Is Report," written by Virginia Prewett.

The article reads as follows:

New York, September 21.—The U.S. labor attaché at Rome is encouraging the Italian Government to force Italian seamen to sail two struck supply ships to Fidel Castro, a National Maritime Union official charged here today.

The two ships, the *Aerone* and the *Nazzareno*, loaded with Russian and Italian supplies to Cuba, have been tied up at the

Calabrian port of Reggio since September 15 because 12 Italian seamen refused to operate them.

"We have had a call for help from the Italian union who says that their Government is threatening to lift the seamen's cards if they don't sail the ships," said a spokesman for NMU, President Joseph Curran. "And they say that the U.S. labor attaché at Rome is into it."

The State Department lists Mr. John C. Fuess as American labor attaché in the Italian capital.

DETERMINED

"Last winter the State Department stopped the boycott against Castro shipping out of U.S. ports," said the NMU official. "But we don't mean to give in this time."

When the State Department stopped the boycott, he said, the union was told to "mind union business, and let the State Department run foreign policy."

The Italian strike, start of unofficial boycott tryouts against Castro shipping, has already been followed by action by U.S. union groups in New York and Texas. On September 19, NMU seamen began to picket a West German flagship, the *SS Olendorf* at Corpus Christi, Tex.

"The NMU protests ships of countries receiving American aid carrying cargoes to Cuba," says placards carried by the pickets. NMU officials charge that the ship, although it has the "paper destination" of West Germany, actually would carry grain to Fidel Castro.

REFUSAL

Yesterday, a New York International Longshoremen's Association union refused to load a Russia bound Belgian freighter with drums of chemicals because they said it "might be used to make gunpowder for Fidel Castro."

When NMU Chief Joe Curran on September 12 called for a world boycott of Castro's supply line, labor circles expressed fears that U.S. officials might try to interfere with the strike.

This was true even though the U.S. Government is supposedly pressuring its NATO allies to stop their ships from carrying Russian supplies to Castro.

The NMU told the Washington Daily News on September 19 that Maritime Union leaders of the United States, Britain, West Germany, Italy and other countries have already unofficially agreed that, "something must be done" about Fidel Castro's regime. They expect the International Federation of Transport Workers, which has 8.5 million members in 100 countries, to declare an official boycott at a meeting to be held in London during the first week in October.

Mr. President, I just read this article in the afternoon edition of the Washington Daily News. I see the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Chamber. I wonder if he has any information on this subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have nothing more than what the Senator from South Carolina has. I read the article with considerable misgiving. Certainly I would be very much concerned if the report should be true.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In the presentation of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, he confirmed the fact that the State De-

19244

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 21

partment is working with the NATO countries in trying to discourage participation in shipments to Cuba. Consequently, it was with real shocking astonishment that I also read the same story on the front page of the Washington Daily News today.

Obviously I have had no opportunity to confirm the situation portrayed in the story. But if the reports are factual, it seems to me that it becomes mandatory for someone in Government—presumably the State Department or the Department of Labor—to call home the American official who evidently is working at direct odds with the State Department in encouraging seamen abroad to do the very type of thing that the Secretary of State is discouraging countries from permitting.

I noticed in the article that a congressional committee was called upon for an immediate investigation. I hope that the Senator from South Carolina, with his customary diligence and energy, will follow through on this point, because it is one which we should know about with absolute definiteness before we start marking up the foreign aid bill. Senators may recall that the House has inserted in the foreign aid appropriation bill a great deal of prohibitory language, one paragraph of which is related to the fact that all economic aid would be suspended from any country which is participating in trade with Cuba. It was in relationship to the desire of the State Department to have that paragraph stricken, or at least modified, that the presentation was made that this was being done by negotiations through diplomatic channels instead of by some kind of coercive step.

I am sure that the State Department representatives spoke accurately about their plans and program. But if, while they are doing that and while we are considering in proposed legislation whether or not Congress must act by means of a coercive paragraph other officials of the Government in Italy are literally thumbing their noses at the State Department policy. We had better find out about it before we vote on foreign aid, because we have the remedy available. We can insert prohibitions, if necessary. Certainly if the story is correct, we had better be sure we write in legislative language to insure that the Government will be able to control the attitudes and actions of its own employees abroad whenever they do definite violence to the announced policies of the Government at home.

I was very happy when Joe Curran and the NMU took this patriotic step to establish a sort of voluntary prohibition on themselves against loading shipments for Communist countries. I was glad when they induced associated unions abroad to join them. It was not a governmental policy. It involved the right of free men freely to decide not to help Communists conquer other free men. I salute the union for its salutary action. I hope the Senator from South Carolina can report to us on Monday that either the story is false—which seems dubious—or that the necessary correc-

tive actions have been taken and the offending officer abroad called home.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from South Dakota. If the news article is true, this is a shocking incident. It will be shocking to the American people to know that an official of our Government, the U.S. Labor Attaché at Rome, should be encouraging the Italian Government to force Italian seamen to sail two supply ships to Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Mr. President, it is well acknowledged now that Castro is a Communist. It is acknowledged that thousands of Russian and Chinese troops are now in Cuba.

It has been acknowledged that there are missiles in Cuba. It is well known that Cuba is being built up as a strong Communist military base. It is well known that Cuba is being used as a distribution point for literature and propaganda of the Communists throughout Central and South America.

It is my judgment that this matter should be looked into very carefully, and that action should be taken if the report is true.

I feel very deeply about this question because, as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said, according to our highest officials, our Government is now pressuring our NATO allies to stop their ships from carrying supplies to Castro.

The National Maritime Union does not want these supplies to go to Cuba. Yet this labor attaché, according to the news item, is encouraging the Italian Government to force Italian seamen to sail the two struck ships anyway. The only purpose would be to carry supplies to our enemy, international communism.

The only regret I had about the resolution that was passed yesterday, and which I supported, and was pleased to support, was that it did not go further than it did and say that Khrushchev should get out of Cuba, because we know full well that the Communists are in Cuba. I do not believe the resolution went far enough in the provisions it contained.

It seems to me that we must take a stronger stand than we are at the present time. Either we are going to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, or we are going to reinterpret the Monroe Doctrine and let it go by the board. We ought to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. This reported action, if it is true, by an official of our Government, is reprehensible, and I am sure will not meet with the approval of the American people. I believe it is a step which jeopardizes the security of this Nation and the entire free world.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I read the story a few minutes ago in the Cloakroom, before I addressed the Senate on the subject of timber. I do not recall whether it mentions the name of the labor attaché.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Therefore it should be easy for us to verify the accuracy or

inaccuracy of the story. Certainly Congress and the country have a right to expect summary action by bringing this attaché home if the story is correct. It will not take very long to determine the accuracy of it.

Mr. THURMOND. The news item states:

The State Department lists Mr. John C. Fuess as the American labor attaché in the Italian capital.

I do not know whether he is the gentleman who is serving in this post at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure, for example, that the Subcommittee on Appropriations now dealing with the foreign aid bill will welcome the opportunity to ask Mr. Fuess whether he was acting on his own initiative or whether someone higher up in the echelon of his superiors ordered him to do this, because it is about time to determine whether one branch of the Government knows what the other branch is doing toward Cuba and toward communism. If they are fighting each other, no wonder we are making such small progress in our resistance to communism abroad.

I congratulate the Italian seamen, who are working with Joe Curran and the International Maritime Union in this country, and who voluntarily have declined to load the ships which carry merchandise to Cuba.

I only wish that the statesmen of Europe would catch up with the seamen of Europe in their foresightedness and in their realism in recognizing the dangers which will occur to the whole free world if we continue to feed and arm and equip and provide troops for a great Red fortress a few miles from Florida.

I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina in bringing this matter to the attention of the country as emphatically and as promptly as he has.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. Further, the article states, as I read a few moments ago:

"Last winter the State Department stopped the boycott against Castro shipping out of U.S. ports," said the NMU official. "But we don't mean to give in this time."

I hope he will stand his ground. I hope he will have the fortitude and courage to stand on the statement he has made and not give in to the State Department in this instance, if the State Department should condone such an act by the labor attaché in Rome.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe there is a better prospect now that the State Department will support this voluntary action by the union in this country headed by Joe Curran, and that they will take action against this official who has gone contrary to the expressed public policy of the State Department, because the State Department is now confronted by the situation, under the leadership of Mr. OTTO PASSEMAN, a Representative from the State of Louisiana, that the House has written into the foreign aid bill a number of salutary amendments to the

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19245

foreign aid bill. Some of them may be too severe. Some of them may need to be modified. Some may need to be strengthened.

The Secretary of State properly came before our committee to discuss the bill this morning, and among other things he said he wished we would modify what he considers to be a too summary action against NATO countries when the Department is now told under the act, under the leadership of OTTO PASSMAN and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the vast majority of the Members of the House, when they passed the aid bill, "No more aid at all to any country which is shipping supplies and arms and guns to an enemy of the United States in Cuba, right off our very shores."

He said, "That is pretty rough. That is not very diplomatic language."

Let us be diplomatic about it. There may be merit to his request. Perhaps it can be done the diplomatic way. I express the hope, because the State Department now faces an undiplomatic maneuver by the House, that it will be active in seeing if it can encourage rather than discourage the efforts of seamen around the world who voluntarily and freely refrain from supplying ships carrying arms to the Communist enemy in Cuba.

Mr. THURMOND. I read further from the article:

When the State Department stopped the boycott, he said, the union was told to "mind union business, and let the State Department run foreign policy."

I hope that this time the State Department's eyes are being opened to some extent, and that they will not try to cast aside this incident and tell the union to mind its business and let the State Department conduct foreign policy.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe there is hope in the picture, because I believe the State Department has learned that when it conducts foreign policy in such a way that the House of Representatives, at least, is shocked by what is happening, the House demonstrates its capacity to indicate to the State Department how it should be conducted.

Obviously the State Department does not want to relinquish its diplomatic rates. The House of Representatives was within its rights when it wrote in that restriction. I hope the Senate will insist on having a concerted and consistent stand taken against communism in the Western Hemisphere, and not have our representative here saying one thing and our representative abroad saying something else.

Mr. THURMOND. If this incident is correctly reported, it is truly amazing. However, I would not be surprised if it turns out to be true, after having heard evidence about the muzzling of the military in our investigation during the past year, when we learned of the policy of the State Department, which I have characterized as the "no win" policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have had the staff director of the Foreign Relations Committee check this incident, with the State Department, and I am pleased to make this report. It is from the State Department. The Rome Embassy denies the story. The State Department says there is nothing to it. It is my information that the Washington Daily News killed the story in its later editions.

Mr. MUNDT. It is indeed gratifying news, if it is correct. As I said a few moments ago, since the name of the attaché has been mentioned, we now have the capacity freely to find out whether or not the story is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have had very little to say during this discussion, because I learned long ago that when rumors of this kind come out, the wise thing to do is to run them down as quickly as possible. If Senators will read the story carefully, they will see that it is really third or fourth-hand reporting. As I said a few moments ago, if it were true, I would be greatly concerned and greatly shocked. I am delighted to have this report, that the Rome Embassy promptly denied the story.

It is my information that our representatives in Rome, instead of asking the labor people to go ahead and load the ship, went to the ship owners—the shipping line—and inquired what they were doing, what the cargo was, and questions of that kind.

Mr. MUNDT. Did our representatives try to persuade the ship operators not to ship the supplies to Cuba?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish I knew; but in the short time that was available, that was all the information I could obtain.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I hope the information which has been furnished by the staff, and which was furnished them by the Embassy in Rome, is true. I hope it is true, although I am not altogether convinced that it is, because I myself had a disgusting experience with the State Department only last year.

I delivered an address in Little Rock, Ark., last year, in which I charged that the State Department had prepared a document relating to disarmament. The Department categorically denied that statement and issued the denial to the press throughout the Nation.

Several days later I delivered an address in which I cited the number of the document, No. 7277, and the State Department never retracted its denial, although it knew, or should have known, when it made the statement that there was no such paper. It was telling an untruth.

In this instance, I am not convinced that the information we have received is the truth. I hope it is the truth. I expect to look further into the question, because, unless Miss Virginia Prewitt is completely incorrect, the statement is a direct quotation of President Joseph Curran, of the National Maritime Union.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The pending business is H.R. 11880.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, what was the motion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had not made a motion. I was about to ask that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 13067.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT RELATING TO PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 13067.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill (H.R. 13067) to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act with respect to the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to pay certain real property taxes and to make payments in lieu of real property taxes was read twice by its title.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, this is a House bill which came to the Senate. At the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the bill was held at the desk and the entire committee polled. The bill was unanimously approved by the members of the Committee. The bill relates to an FHA project at Forest Hills, near Paducah, Ky. It was a Wherry housing project.

Unlike most Wherry projects, this one was located on property which was privately owned, and real property taxes were paid before foreclosure. The FHA foreclosed the property and for 3 years paid taxes, then ceased, believing that it had no authority to continue to pay taxes.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the FHA to make such tax payments. The bill has the approval of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and has received clearance from the Bureau of the Budget. It was passed by the House and received unanimous approval by all members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the bill was not referred to committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I move that the bill be taken from the desk for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an excerpt from the House committee report (No. 2373) outlining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

19246

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 21

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would give the Federal Housing Administration the same authority to pay taxes on certain acquired military housing projects which is provided in existing law for other FHA programs.

Property of the United States is not subject to taxation by a State or any subdivision thereof unless such taxation is specifically authorized by Federal law. In the case of the Federal Housing Administration's program of mortgage and loan insurance on residential real property, the Congress has provided express authority for the Federal Housing Commissioner, as a general rule, to make taxpayments with respect to property acquired by him after foreclosure or after transfers in lieu of foreclosures. In authorizing these taxpayments, the Congress recognized that the property acquired by FHA would normally be returned to private ownership through sale as soon as it was feasible for the FHA to do so, and that in the interim it was desirable that such property not be removed from the tax base of the local community by reason of its acquisition by the FHA.

This bill would authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to make payments in lieu of taxes on any real property, title to which has been or is acquired by him in fee as a result of insurance operations conducted under the old section 803 (Wherry Act) on which taxes were being paid prior to acquisition. In addition, it would authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to pay real property taxes on property which has been or is acquired and held by the Commissioner as a result of insurance operations under sections 809 and 310 of the National Housing Act.

This bill was considered in executive session by the Subcommittee on Housing on September 12 and by the full Committee on Banking and Currency on September 13 and was approved without a dissenting vote. The bill has the endorsement of the administration as shown in the following letter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, H.R. 13067 was passed on the House Consent Calendar. The bill passed by the House was introduced by Congressman STUBBLEFIELD. I introduced the bill in the Senate, but it was modified to incorporate suggestions approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The problem concerns the Forest Hills housing project in Paducah, Ky., in Congressman STUBBLEFIELD's district. This project, built in 1954 at the insistence of the Atomic Energy Commission as a Wherry project, was repossessed by the Federal Housing Administration in 1956. FHA paid property taxes to the city in 1957, 1958, and 1959, but discontinued these payments in 1960 on the advice of their counsel, although the city is still supplying services.

While most Wherry projects are military housing located on Government property, and the problem of payments in lieu of taxes does not arise, therefore; this Wherry project is not located on Government property. And, while there is provision in law for payment of taxes, or payments in lieu of taxes, on property repossessed or acquired by the Commissioner of FHA under other programs, there is no specific provision for this type of payment on repossessed housing projects built under the Wherry program.

House bill 13067 would extend to the Wherry projects the same authority to pay local property taxes as is now au-

thorized for repossessions under the other housing insurance programs if payments were made prior to repossession. Not aware of any objections to the bill, I have been working for several years with city officials, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and local citizens who have been trying to obtain a solution of the Forest Hills problem. Difficult as it is, it is further complicated by the unpaid taxes. I urge that the bill be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 13067) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OATH PRESCRIBED FOR INDIVIDUALS ENLISTED INTO THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2029, H.R. 218.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 218) to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, before the bill is passed, I desire to propound certain questions to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is handling the bill on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services.

Will the Senator from South Carolina give a brief explanation of the purpose of the bill?

Mr. THURMOND. The intention of the Armed Services Committee in favorably reporting this bill is to conform the oath which enlisted men take to that which is administered to persons appointed or elected to civil or military office. The oath which is prescribed in section 16 of title 5 of the United States Code for all persons elected or appointed to any office of honor or profit, either in the civil, military, or naval service, and this, of course, covers Senators, includes an obligation to support and defend the Constitution and has at the end the words, "so help me God." In contrast to this, the oath which is presently administered to enlisted personnel in the armed services which can be found in section 501 of title 10 of the United States Code, does not contain an obligation to support and defend the Constitution, nor does it have the words "so help me God," at the conclusion. The committee can find no valid reason for having this difference in the oaths and therefore has reported favorably this bill which, incidentally, has already been passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the bill in any way affect, alter, or amend either the law or the practice with regard to the choice which any individual now has to affirm or take an oath?

Mr. THURMOND. I should say it does not.

On pages 2 and 3 of the report under the heading "Constitutional Question" the Senator will find this point discussed. In the committee's opinion, the present status of the law amply provides for this choice. There was testimony before the subcommittee concerning the option to drop the words "so help me God" when a person chose, for valid reasons, to affirm rather than swear. The only logical distinction which can be drawn between "oath" and "affirmation" is that in an oath there is an imprecation. The Deity is called upon to witness the verity of the statement made, while in an affirmation a person does not call upon the Deity, but only upon his own conscience. Title 1 of section 1 of the United States Code, which says in part, "in determining the meaning of any act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise 'oath' includes affirmation and 'swear' includes affirmed." Also, the first section of the oath provided for in the bill is in the alternative, "swear" or "affirm." The report points out that a Federal circuit court decision has upheld the right of a person to drop the words "So help me God" when he chooses to affirm, rather than swear.

The committee is of the opinion that this adequately covers any problem which might exist in this area; but we further feel that should any change in the law be necessary, it should be accomplished uniformly as to all presently existing sections of law which prescribe oaths, rather than by making an exception in this one case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for giving that explanation.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

I shall be glad to respond to any other questions which Senators may wish to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question.

I think the report to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred, in regard to the matter of dealing with military personnel who because of religious convictions refuse to swear, but prefer to affirm, is excellent. As one who believes in God, I find it difficult to appreciate fully the attitude of those who might object to the reference, at the end of the oath, to the Almighty. But without having the affirmation set out in the bill, and with only the oath set out in the bill, are not we likely to find that some administrative difficulties will arise?

It has been my experience and observation that there are at least two groups of such persons. There are those who refuse to swear at all, and insist only on affirmation. Then there are those who

nents of the bill have an answer, it seems to me further study and recommitment for that purpose should be required.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

With respect to the colloquy between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Wisconsin as to the availability of salt water, the Shedd Aquarium which displays both fresh and salt water specimens at Chicago has no difficulty with that problem. The aquarium in Chicago is not located on the east or west coast, but is almost a thousand miles from any ocean. Salt water is delivered to it by tank car. Its original supply of salt water was collected off Key West and hauled to the aquarium in the Chicago lakefront before the tracks were removed following construction of this beautiful building. Sea water was stored in huge concrete pools more than 30 years ago. That water has been used over and over, and is being supplemented only when new salt water fish specimens are brought in from Florida. That problem was considered by the Senate committee and by the House in its debate. Brackish water is not exactly salt water, but there is the Chesapeake Bay, near the District of Columbia, in the vicinity of where the aquarium would be constructed. The point is one that was not overlooked in the committee or in the debate in the House.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I notice he has not said anything about the cost. I have communications from the operators of aquariums in my own State who tell me that it is quite a task to keep available the necessary supply of clear salt water for aquariums that are on the shore there. It costs a great deal of money to do it. They think the cost involved would be very great. They know the waters of the Potomac would not be suitable, because they are highly polluted and murky.

I think, unless there is something in the report indicating what the cost for that item would be, which would be a constant, day-to-day cost throughout the life of the aquarium, that is one feature which deserves and requires study and report as to the cost that would be involved.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

It will be a few more minutes before I yield the floor.

The Senator from Iowa has put his finger on a very crucial part of the bill in referring to section 8. The Senator from Ohio has discussed it. I want to discuss it again. I want to emphasize how flimsy it is with respect to an assurance that any substantial cost is going to be covered in the bill. The section reads:

Funds appropriated and expended hereunder for construction of the buildings for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium shall not exceed \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the expenditure of such funds shall be made subject to the condition that the Secretary of the Interior shall establish charges relating to visitation to the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium and he may establish charges for other uses at such rates as in the Secretary's judgment will produce revenues to cover an appropriate—

I emphasize these words "an appropriate"—share of the annual operation and maintenance costs thereof.

It does not say a full share. It says "an appropriate share." If it cost \$800,000, an appropriate share, in his judgment, might be \$50,000 or \$100,000. There is nothing in the bill that provides that it is to be one-half or one-third of the maintenance cost. Whatever he chooses to cover he can cover.

It is true that estimates in the report show that he may provide for the charging of fees that will bring in \$1 million, but, as I pointed out, this estimate is based on a most optimistic and unrealistic notion in view of the record of public aquariums. The figures show they do not come within a mile of covering the costs, if adults are to be charged 50 cents and children 25 cents, unless a super promotion and a fancy aquarium show is put on, and nobody has proposed that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The section to which the Senator has just referred does not say that the charges collected for admission shall help amortize the cost of the capital investment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is an excellent point. It does not come close to it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. RANDOLPH. On my time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield the Senator from Iowa 3 minutes on my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 8, to strike out all of lines 1 through 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Charges relating to visitation to and uses of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium at such rates as in the Secretary's judgment will produce revenues to (a) liquidate the costs of construction within a period of not to exceed 80 years and (b) pay for the annual operation and maintenance costs thereof.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment is self-explanatory. It is designed to conform with the policy which was recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I had the honor of being a member, and which rendered a report

to the President this year. That Commission recommends very strongly that there be an increased use of user fees for the purpose of defraying the cost of recreational facilities.

Regardless of how one feels about the timeliness of this bill, it seems to me our policy ought to be to have this a self-liquidating, self-maintaining operation.

I understand informally from one of the members of the staff that approximately \$500,000 a year is estimated for the cost of maintenance, operation, and amortization involved.

If there were 2 million visitors, at the rate of 25 cents a person, the \$500,000 would be taken care of. This is not to suggest a flat fee of 25 cents. The fee might be \$1 for adults and 10 cents for schoolchildren.

In addition, it is contemplated that auditorium facilities would be furnished, occasionally at no charge and on other occasions at a charge, and charges would be made for uses of the facilities by scientific and commercial interests.

It seems to me my amendment is not a grasping in the dark. I think it has real possibilities for fulfillment. I hope my amendment will be agreed to. I think it would improve the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield me a few minutes of time, so that I may speak on another matter which is quite important?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 48 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Wisconsin have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Washington.

Cuba SHIPPING EMBARGO OF CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on yesterday, prior to the passage of the joint resolution with respect to Cuba, I commented upon the fact that certain Italian seamen refused to sail two struck supply ships which were going to Cuba and to Castro. I commended them on that action, and suggested that the State Department should do what it could in that regard, along with action by our Government, including the passage of the joint resolution by the Senate. I suggested that we try to encourage other NATO maritime countries to follow the same practice.

The American Merchant Marine Institute has called on maritime lines throughout the free world to ban the carrying of Russian cargoes to Havana, and has urged President Kennedy to support this embargo.

Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, and Capt. William Bradley, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, have joined in a demand for a world boycott of arms shipments to Cuba.

would offer great opportunities for research. But I submit that anyone who reads the hearings—and I have read them all the way through—would be hard put to find in them any documentation of the kind of research to be done, who would conduct it, what would be done, why it is needed, or what benefits the research to be done would provide. All that is dealt with in very vague and general terms.

The fact is that we now have some excellent research centers, conducting research under the Fish and Wildlife Service. Research is undertaken by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, at La Jolla, Calif.; at the Woods Hole Oceanography Laboratory, at Woods Hole, Mass.; and at the Solomon's Island station, in Maryland. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time anyone has seriously attempted to justify the construction of a major city display aquarium on the ground that it would assist in research. Research is conducted in establishments specifically designed for that purpose, and experts are employed to conduct it there. But research is not conducted in an aquarium of this kind. Any attempt to conduct research in an aquarium would remind one of a distinguished Member of Congress who was reported to have recently traveled in Europe, for the purpose of studying the equality of opportunity for women at Parisian striptease joints. Obviously, the place to engage in research is an establishment designed for that specific purpose.

EFFECTIVE RESEARCH DONE IN FIELD

Furthermore, Mr. President, we should note that the Fish and Wildlife Service is comprised of two bureaus. One of them is the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. It studies fish husbandry, and the research done there is concerned primarily with fish husbandry, which comprises the study of nutrition and diseases of fish, and attempts to show the rice farmers in Arkansas and neighboring States methods of alternating the production of rice with the production of fish.

This Bureau also engages in pesticide studies on the effect of sprays, and so forth, on fishes and the organisms in the waters.

The Bureau also engages in reservoir research concerned with research for the management of fisheries in reservoirs constructed by the Federal Government; it also engages in marine sport fishery research, a new program, just getting underway, to assess the extent of the sport fishery for marine species.

These studies are being developed at the present time or are underway in establishments subsidized and paid for by the Federal Government.

In the second place, the Fish and Wildlife Service maintains a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, which is concerned primarily with exploratory fishing—in other words, the finding of new fishing grounds for the industry; and this Bureau is also concerned with gear development, which comprises the development of new fishing techniques and methods, and so forth; it is also con-

cerned with market promotion and the determination of new methods of preservation of fish for marketing; and it also studies the passage of fish at dams, primarily on the west coast, in relation to the passage of salmon at dams.

SERIOUS RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA, MASSACHUSETTS, MARYLAND

Research is also conducted at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, in California, and at the Woods Hole Oceanography Laboratory, in Massachusetts. At both these laboratories approximately 95 percent of the research work is under contract with the Office of Naval Research, and concerns studies of oceanography, including ocean currents, depths, temperatures, salinities, and stocks of fish. The Office of Naval Research not only finances the research at these two laboratories, but also has provided much of the money for construction of facilities and purchase of equipment.

Research is also done at the Solomons Island, Md., station, which is operated by the State of Maryland. This laboratory is concerned primarily with the management of the shellfish and fish of Chesapeake Bay. The University of Maryland participates in the activities at the Solomons Island station, for studies of water resources. At the Solomons Island station there is a Natural Resources Institute, operated in conjunction with the University of Maryland.

Mr. President, if the sponsors of the bill are interested in research, it seems to me that some indications that research work would be done at the proposed National Fisheries Center and Aquarium would have been evident at the hearings. But, as I have said, although I have studied the hearings very carefully, I was not able to find any documentation or any support or any evidence in regard to the kind of research which would be conducted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To corroborate the argument made by the Senator from Wisconsin, I should like to read from section 1 of the bill.

AUTHORIZATION FOR NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM

SECTION 1. (a) The Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is hereby authorized to plan, construct, and maintain a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia or its vicinity for the display of fresh water and marine fishes and other aquatic resources for educational, recreational, cultural, and scientific purposes.

Fish would be displayed, but there would be no installation of research facilities in the building, if the provisions of the bill are followed.

That is section 1 of the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. An analysis of the bill line by line, as the Senator from Ohio is doing, shows that the bill is not designed for research.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is for the display of fresh water and marine fishes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. That is a perfectly proper objective; but let us debate the bill on the basis of what it actually provides.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And in section 2, which deals with the operation of the proposed Center and Aquarium, there is no indication that research work will be done in this institution. It is intended to be visited by people who, by looking at the fish to be displayed there would gain in education. But if that amounts to research, I simply do not understand the meaning of the term. I think a reading of the testimony taken at the hearings will disclose that the proposed Center and Aquarium are intended primarily for the entertainment of visitors who come to Washington.

Incidentally, they will acquire education by seeing the various species of fish, but it will not be through research, as the Senator from Wisconsin has so clearly pointed out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has submitted an amendment which I think has a great deal of appeal. I would be very interested in supporting it, but I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that, in view of the record I have just discussed and the experience of other aquariums, he give real consideration, in offering the amendment, to supporting a motion that the bill be recommitted for the purpose of studying whether it would be practical or feasible to require the Interior Department to try to raise \$10 million, pay the interest, and cover all maintenance costs in a period of 30 years. It may be possible, but I submit, based on all the experience of the aquariums in this country, that it could not be done.

Other public aquariums do not draw big enough crowds to cover maintenance costs, let alone amortization costs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I commend the Senator on the position he has taken. Second, I ask him if there has been any showing as to how much it would cost to continue to provide a supply of usable salt water at the so-called Aquarium for the display of fish. There is no water at the site except the polluted and murky waters of the Potomac, which are at most merely brackish. Has it been estimated how much it would cost to provide clear, constantly usable salt water for this project?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I think he raises a fascinating point. It had not occurred to this Senator before. It is an excellent point from the standpoint of engineering. It is quite a different problem to provide salt water at New York City or along the coasts of California or Florida, where the aquariums are located on the coasts, but when an aquarium is to be located many miles from a supply of salt water, as in this case, it seems to me the cost would be immense. I think this is an excellent point and a real basis for further study. Unless the propo-

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Seattle Post Intelligencer which salutes these men on their patriotism. The editorial states, in conclusion:

Obviously, the American people are ahead of the administration in taking action to cripple the buildup of a Communist stronghold 90 miles from our shores.

I commend these people for their efforts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN OF ACTION

While official Washington marks time, management and labor in the maritime industry are doing something about the buildup of Communist power in Castro's Cuba.

The American Merchant Marine Institute, representing the shipowners, has called on maritime lines throughout the free world to ban the carrying of Russian cargoes to Havana. It has urged President Kennedy to support this embargo.

Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, and Capt. William Bradley, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, have joined in a demand for a world boycott of arms shipments to Cuba.

And Captain Bradley has warned that his longshoremen will refuse to handle shipments by any American companies that are known to be supplying Castro by sending goods through such ports as Antwerp.

We salute these men for their patriotism. Obviously, the American people are ahead of the administration in taking action to cripple the buildup of a Communist stronghold 90 miles from our shores.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I read today in the first edition of the Washington Daily News that a U.S. labor attaché in Rome is encouraging the Italian Government to force the Italian seamen to sail on these two ships. The report comes from Mr. Curran himself.

"We have had a call for help from the Italian union who says that their government is threatening to lift the seamen's cards if they don't sail the ships," said a spokesman for NMU President Joseph Curran. "And they say that the U.S. labor attaché at Rome is into it."

The State Department lists Mr. John C. Fuess as American labor attaché in the Italian capital.

"Last winter the State Department stopped the boycott against Castro shipping out of U.S. ports," said the NMU official. "But we don't mean to give in this time."

It was also pointed out that:

They expect the International Federation of Transport Workers, which has 6.5 million members in 100 countries, to declare an official boycott at a meeting to be held in London during the first week in October.

I commend Mr. Curran, Captain Bradley, and the American Merchant Marine Institute for what they are doing. It is what I suggested about a month ago. This could have a great effect in respect to our struggle with the Cuban problem, along with the joint resolution which has been passed.

I suggest to the American labor attaché in the Italian capital, whether his name be "Mr. Fuess" or something else, that he cease and desist from interfering with the free rights of these seamen, who believe that they should not participate in any aid to the Castro govern-

ment. He should cease and desist from interfering with their free rights.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to accommodate my friend.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8181) to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and to provide for its operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa, who is a member of the Committee on Public Works, has been discussed informally by several members of the committee, and by several Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee. It is my feeling that the request made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is not an unreasonable one. We are willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes from the time in opposition.

I am opposed to the amendment, because there ought to be hearings on it. We do not have the slightest idea that we can work out an amortization program on the basis of any such fee paying principle as has been proposed. I think the amendment proves the soundness of a motion which I shall make, that the entire bill be recommitted to the committee, so that there can be further hearings not only in regard to the amortization program, but also in regard to some other issues which I wish to raise in my speech in opposition to the bill.

I have gone through the transcript of the hearings. There is nothing in the hearings which gives the Senate any evidence on which to pass judgment on the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the Miller amendment. This raises the entire question, also, as to whether or not entrance fees ought to be charged by the Federal Government for a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium. I shall have something to say about fees later.

If we have reached the point where the amendment is before the Senate and action is about to be taken on it, I think the time has come to take action on a motion to recommit the entire bill to the committee for further hearings. The committee should carefully consider the issue raised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the question as to how best to amortize the cost of the aquarium, wherever it may be built.

About the last place in America where it ought to be built is on Hains Point, adjacent to the Potomac River, which is

the filthiest river of its size in the world, the shores of which are now lined with tons of dead fish, according to newspaper accounts. Those fish are dead because they cannot live in the densley filthy Potomac River, yet it is proposed to spend \$10 million to build an aquarium adjacent to that river.

I will tell Senators what we ought to do with the \$10 million. We ought to clean up the Potomac River so that fish can live in it, so that little boys and girls and adults can swim in it, so that people can go boating on it, so that it will be a sanitary river rather than a constant flowing threat to the health of the people of the District of Columbia, of Maryland and of Virginia.

It is beyond my power of comprehension why there is even any talk about building a fisheries center and a fisheries research center on the dirtiest, stinkiest river in the world for its size.

At least we ought to put the aquarium on some clean river.

Furthermore, the talk about wishing to do something so that the people will have something to see when they come to Washington, D.C., is rather silly. There is so much for the people to see now in this city that they would have to stay here, most tourists would tell us, a month to even begin to see the things they would like to see—the Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, the Capitol, the White House, the great art museums and all the rest.

This city is not lacking in tourist attractions, Mr. President. A lot of other areas of this country are.

I will tell Senators what I would be willing to consider, should the bill go back to the committee. I would be willing to consider some evidence as to whether the aquarium ought not to be located in Ohio, on the Great Lakes, and named the Kirwan Aquarium, in honor of that great Representative in the House of Representatives who is so much interested in the bill. I should like to honor him, too, but I am not going to honor him, in my judgment, by voting for an aquarium to be built at Hains Point, or any other area in the Washington area on the polluted, dirty, stinking Potomac River. We in the Congress ought to be ashamed of ourselves because we have not cleaned it up.

We ought to take the \$10 million and use it for cleansing the Potomac River of pollution.

Mr. President, I do not wish to encroach further on the prerogative of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I did not see him; he was not in the Chamber when I started to speak, and I assumed the authority, as his colleague in opposition to the bill, to yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I raise a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that this is an appropriate time, prior to action on the Miller amendment, to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works,

so that further hearings may be held on the bill and on the Miller amendment? There have been no hearings on the Miller amendment. A very complicated subject of amortization is raised by the amendment. We ought to have some evidence submitted on that subject as well as on many other questions to which I shall direct my attention later, if necessary. The Fish and Wildlife Service has not given us sufficient evidence to pass a sound value judgment on the bill.

My first parliamentary inquiry is as follows: Would it be in order at this time to move to recommit the entire bill? Second, since a motion to recommit is debatable, would the time for the debate upon that motion have to be taken out of the 3 hours under the unfortunate unanimous-consent agreement that was entered into yesterday, when I was attending to Senate business off the floor of the Senate, and which never would have been entered into had I been present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order and is debatable under the time limitation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion? We are operating under a time limitation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall withhold my request, provided I do not lose my right to make it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois if he would consent that the time necessary for the quorum call be taken for neither side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am agreeable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 273 Leg.]

Allott	Hart	Morse
Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Holland	Neuberger
Boggs	Humphrey	Pearson
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Bush	Johnston	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Russell
Carlson	Keating	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Case	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Lausche	Sparkman
Church	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Clark	Long, La.	Symington
Cooper	Mansfield	Talmadge
Cotton	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dirksen	McClellan	Tower
Douglas	McGee	Wiley
Ellender	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Miller	Yarborough
Fong	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas

[Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senators from Maryland [Mr. BEALL and Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BORTUM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKAL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUEHLL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the motion to recommit, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has offered an amendment which I think, after a cursory examination of it, has great merit; but it is an amendment which I believe calls for hearings. It deals with the whole question of how to amortize the \$10 million aquarium, if the Senate should make the unfortunate judgment of deciding to build it. I think the committee should take testimony with respect to the entire amortization program. But the bill ought to be recommitted to the Committee on Public Works anyway, for further consideration with respect to the question of the situs of the aquarium. I believe that probably the worst possible place to build an aquarium, of all places to be made available, is Hains Point in Washington, D.C. As I said a few minutes ago, the Potomac River is the filthiest river of its size in the world, a river which, as I speak, has its shores lined with tons of dead fish, dead because they could not live in the pollution of the stream. In fact, I believe the \$10 million ought to be used to clean up the river rather than to build an aquarium on its shores.

Furthermore, the supply of land in this city for public use is very limited; and, in my judgment, Hains Point is not the place for an aquarium. I believe that once the river has been cleaned up, it ought to be an important center for recreational use—an attractive center for swimming, boating, and fishing.

I also think we ought to have more information. I have examined the hear-

ings carefully, and there is a notable absence of data which should be obtained from the Fish and Wildlife Service. I have some data which I shall use later this afternoon with respect to the question of situs.

The Government already has a large sum of money invested in Federal fisheries throughout the country, any of which could be expanded in order to be an appropriate site for an aquarium.

A strong plea has been made for tourism. It is said that an aquarium would be an attraction for tourists to Washington, D.C. There are so many attractions in Washington, D.C., that tourists would have to spend a month or more really to make a start at seeing them. We could talk about the Smithsonian, the art galleries, the Library of Congress. We could talk about the multitude of facilities which are appealing to tourists. This is one city in the United States which does not need to provide more attractions for tourists to visit. There are many other places in the country where Federal dollars ought to be spent to attract tourists, if Federal dollars are to be used for that purpose.

A strong case could be made for building the aquarium on the Great Lakes, on the shores of the State of Ohio. It might be named the Kirwan Aquarium. I think that would be a very fine tribute to a great Representative from Ohio; although I believe there are many other things which might better be named for him in honor of his great record in Congress.

I do not believe the Senate has all the information it needs to justify the authorization or appropriation of \$10 million for the construction of an aquarium in the vicinity of Washington, D.C.

I say again that this sum of money ought to be used to supply some of the urgent needs of the District of Columbia, if the money is to be spent here. Hundreds and hundreds of little boys and girls and adults in the District of Columbia live in hovels that are not as good as pigpens on the most modern farms.

Consider the slum clearance program, the local school construction program, and the housing program, on which \$10 million could better be spent.

We have a great need for an improved educational program in this city and this country. Early next week we shall have a discussion in the Senate with respect to making loans to the school system of this city. This money is needed to tear down firetraps which, as I speak, are housing hundreds of young students of the District of Columbia and are endangering their lives by fire every hour of the schoolday. The \$10 million ought to be spent for that purpose if it is to be spent in the District of Columbia.

Also, 73 military installations in this country have been closed, many of which are located at sites most appropriate for an aquarium. Do not forget that the aquarium that we are talking about is to be an aquarium which will not only be a hotel for fish but also will be a center for fisheries research.

We found, that under a unanimous-consent agreement, a bill which shocked us was to be before the Senate. We intend to do all we can to have the bill defeated. If it were not for the unanimous-consent agreement, I assure the Senate that the bill would be defeated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the Senators who have spoken in their remarks of commendation and praise of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I have served for many years with him, and I have the highest respect and admiration for him.

BLOCKADE OF CUBA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, during the debate on the so-called Cuban resolution yesterday, in some of the statements made after the debate, and in all too many writings by some columnists, there has appeared the view that the imposition of a blockade with respect to war materiel destined for Cuba would be an act of war.

I had hoped that in my lengthy statement on this floor on September 6, I might have encouraged a little more thinking and research on this subject and a little less snap judgment on it than has occurred since then. But apparently my hopes have not been fulfilled.

In the September 21 issue of Life magazine, the lead editorial, entitled "What Should Monroe Doctrine Mean? Blockade," again goes into this subject, and, I suggest, reaffirms my view on it, and makes very clear that a snap judgment on it, without thought to the fine points of this matter, might well be wrong. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine, Sept. 21, 1961]
WHAT SHOULD MONROE DOCTRINE MEAN?
BLOCKADE

Khrushchev's arms buildup in Cuba is an insolent challenge to the Western Hemisphere which has so far drawn no adequate response from the President of the United States. The White House is wrapped in what appears to be indecision. A measure of indecision is understandable, for we have been skillfully ambushed by Khrushchev. But the President must act, and we urge him to invoke the Monroe Doctrine, a foundation stone of U.S. foreign policy, to prevent Castro's further import of Communist arms.

What has happened to the Monroe Doctrine? When Khrushchev pronounced it dead 2 years ago Eisenhower denied it, and so has Kennedy. But Khrushchev is evidently trying to prove it dead or to find out what it means. Being unilateral, the doctrine has always meant just what the United States says it means, including what kind of colonization it is intended to forbid. But to mean anything to Khrushchev, the doctrine needs a fresh definition of the kind the United States will risk a fight for. Kennedy owes the world that clarification.

In his statement admitting the Cuban buildup, Kennedy said it is not yet a serious military threat to the United States. He made a distinction (hardly tenable) between offensive and defensive weapons, implying that a continued buildup will raise the

"gravest issues"—i.e., issues of U.S. preventive action. We suggest that the issue is sufficiently grave already; that the presence of massive Soviet arms and soldiers in this hemisphere is hostile to the Monroe Doctrine, and that it should be specifically defined to exclude them. Russian arms have turned Cuba into a Russian colony as abject as East Germany. If not yet a threat to the continental United States, they are such to the harassed governments of Venezuela, Guatemala, Honduras, and several other members of our hemisphere security system, not to mention our Marine base at Guantanamo or the Panama Canal. And they are a political threat to the U.S. position as a world power.

How then can Kennedy stop further Communist arms to Cuba and make an updated Monroe Doctrine stick? He has taken some first steps. He is bringing pressure on our NATO allies not to let their ships be chartered for this traffic. Dean Rusk has proposed an informal meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers to discuss possible OAS action. Moreover, Kennedy has promised to continue helping Caribbean nations patrol their shores against arms smuggled from Cuba.

These steps are not enough. The next one, we suggest, is that the U.S. Navy, with whatever Latin American support we can muster, stop and search all vessels, especially Soviet vessels, entering Cuban waters and suspected of carrying more Soviet arms or men. The men would be sent home, the arms dumped in the sea.

Rusk has discouraged blockade talk on the ground that it would be "an act of war." But a blockade against armaments is less warlike than Khrushchev's massive arming of Castro. It is less bellicose than Khrushchev's irresponsible redomontade of last week, in which he accused the United States of plotting an invasion of Cuba and threatened nuclear war. An arms blockade—although it may mean war—is not necessarily a formal act of war, especially if the 139-year-old Monroe Doctrine is interpreted to require it.

In so interpreting it, we must of course seek assent from our Latin allies, with whom we have increasingly shared responsibility for the doctrine's definition since 1933. But we have not surrendered this responsibility; the Latins are inclined to evade it; and our whole hemisphere security system depends in the last analysis on U.S. power. Said Kennedy last year: "If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration . . . this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our Nation."

It is true that U.S. interests and security are now global, not merely hemispheric. Kennedy himself seems unduly impressed with Khrushchev's argument that if we support NATO bases near Russia's Turkish border, why can't Russia have bases in our backyard? Though our interests are global, we have a prior commitment to this hemisphere; and there is no law telling us we must not resist aggression until our declared enemy is as worldwide as we.

The Soviet buildup near Florida is the most direct challenge to the Monroe Doctrine since Maximilian invaded Mexico. The reassertion of the doctrine against this threat will reassure our uneasy allies and put spine in the inter-American system. Above all, it will let Khrushchev know that Kennedy, who once said, "Our restraint is not inexhaustible," is not the victim of permanent indecision. A blockade has its dangers, including that of physical sailor-to-sailor contact with the enemy, though the conflict will remain as limited as Khrushchev desires. There is far greater danger in continued piecemeal acceptance of the worldwide Communist advance.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. VIRGINIA WELDON KELLY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have dealt with our military construction authorization and appropriations bills for almost 10 years.

During that time, I have never found an individual more alert or more interested in certain items in these bills, or more concerned about the welfare of our entire military personnel than Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly. She has shown a particular concern for military hospitals, including the Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif.

Mrs. Kelly is a capable and courageous member of the fourth estate.

Mrs. Kelly has been especially interested in the Long Beach Naval Hospital, because she had personal knowledge of the great need for such a hospital in that busy west coast area.

Many, many times I have heard her express her humanitarian interest in the welfare of our military personnel, both enlisted and officer. I know this interest is genuine as her very warm heart has reflected for many years.

In view of my observations of Mrs. Kelly and her generous interest and concern for the welfare of military personnel and their families, I have made special inquiry to learn more about her activities.

On inquiry, I have learned the following facts:

Mrs. Kelly, wife of retired Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly, has devoted much of her spare time as a Navy relief volunteer and Red Cross volunteer, on duty in military hospitals helping to care for the sick and wounded members of our armed services and their wives and children.

During World War II, when her husband was then at sea, Mrs. Kelly lived in Long Beach. Since 1946 Admiral and Mrs. Kelly have lived in Washington where she has been a member of the Congressional press corps for 15 years.

Long Beach did have a naval hospital during World War II, but it was later turned over to the Veterans' Administration, which continues to operate it.

Throughout the years hundreds of servicemen have written Mrs. Kelly, urging her to assist in getting a new hospital for Long Beach.

Before the Korean war, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard closed, causing much unemployment in that area.

Mrs. Kelly took up her pen and wrote newspaper editorials urging the shipyard be reopened. In 1951, it did open again and is still operating.

Other activities in the busy life of Mrs. Virginia Kelly include:

Assistance in organizing the first Navy Wives Club in Seattle during World War II.

Service as a sponsor of a class of reserve midshipmen at the U.S. Naval Academy. She spent a year of her spare time repairing 3,000 hymnals at the academy chapel.

Ever mindful of the needs for military servicemen, she has spent hours as a volunteer worker at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, and has pushed for

dren having the greatest nutritional requirement.

The committee report directs the Secretary of Agriculture to look into this key problem and report as promptly as possible after January 1, 1963.

With this kind of concentrated attention it should be possible for Detroit youngsters and those of the other big cities to benefit more fully from this program. Given the 3-year transition period provided in the Senate bill, participation should be stepped up so that Michigan and the many other States similarly situated will not lose by the passage of this bill; indeed, along with the rest of the country we will gain by having the program operated under a formula which provides equal Federal contribution to all who participate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 11665) was passed.

OPPOSITION TO UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a few moments ago, the Senator from Oregon stated, in effect, that the leadership had asked for unanimous consent with respect to certain measures to which, had he been present, he would have objected. Speaking only for myself, I have followed assiduously over the past several weeks the practice of not asking for unanimous-consent agreements unless the Senator from Oregon was fully aware of my intention and gave his concurrence. It is my understanding that he was on the floor of the Senate yesterday, for example, when an agreement was reached to meet at a time certain on Tuesday next and to vote at a time certain on the conference report on the farm bill. It is my further understanding that on occasion he has been in the Chamber and has indicated he was not averse to unanimous consent being given for the consideration of an amendment.

I assure the Senator from Oregon that I did not ask for unanimous consent with respect to the aquarium bill, although I will take full responsibility for it. I have tried to cooperate with the Senator from Oregon and to accommodate him, as I have with all Senators, in what I have thought he wanted done concerning what the leadership has tried to do in scheduling proposed legislation. I say this not in the form of an apology, but only as an explanation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Montana, my majority leader, need make no statement at all. That was not the desire of the senior Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Montana knows that I agreed to a unanimous-consent request with respect to the con-

ference report on the farm bill. I knew nothing about a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement on the aquarium bill. I have long opposed the proposed authorization for an aquarium until more important needs have first been taken care of. I was not told that there would be a request for unanimous consent to limit debate on the aquarium bill.

I do not say that I have a right to be notified. I do not even ask for that. I have a duty to perform, as does every other Senator, to be present on the floor of the Senate, or to have another Senator representing me. I stepped outside the Chamber momentarily, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] agreed to represent me in case any unanimous-consent requests were made.

I desire the Senator from Montana to know that I am perfectly willing to stand on my record of cooperation with him, just as the Senator from Montana has a right to stand on his record of cooperation with the Senator from Oregon. I think we have had a very fine record of cooperation on procedural matters. I do not know who was responsible for the unanimous-consent agreement on the aquarium bill. Whoever it was had the right to ask for unanimous consent, and if I was not present, that was my fault.

I serve notice that I shall object to unanimous-consent agreements in doubtful cases. If unanimous-consent proposals are made with respect to important measures, such as the farm bill, which is one of the major pieces of proposed legislation that we know we must pass in connection with commitments we have made, I will agree to unanimous consent. But I will not give unanimous consent on doubtful, controversial issues, and certainly not with respect to measures which cannot be considered to be on the "must" list for passage before sine die adjournment, because many such bills are bad. For example, I will not give unanimous consent to limit debate on the so-called Embassy construction bill, unless there can be some consideration of amendments which I desire to offer, which, in my judgment, would remove the bad features of the bill.

That is the position of the Senator from Oregon. I believe the Senator from West Virginia desires to speak, so I shall let him obtain the floor in his own right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall not speak now, but will discuss the subject a little later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Oregon and all other Senators that there will be no subterfuges, no under-the-table deals. If any requests are made, they will be made with the thought in mind that all Senators who are interested in one way or the other will be notified, so that, if possible, their assent may be given beforehand. I realize that many things can happen toward the end of a session; but I assure the Senate that so far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, if he has any control over certain events which sometimes happen, they will not happen.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall assume a part of the responsibility for the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into with respect to the aquarium bill. I vigorously oppose the aquarium bill. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Oregon that there are thousands of places in which \$20 million, \$15 million, or \$10 million could be more intelligently and humanely spent than on the project contemplated by the aquarium bill. I think the leadership and the President ought to tell the Senate to lay this bill aside.

I wish to relate my experience with respect to this subject, and I desire to have the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], especially, listen to it. There was a meeting about 2 months ago at which about 30 persons were present. Those 30 persons comprised Representatives, both Republican and Democratic. The one who presided is a Member of the House of Representatives. The implication was made that the Senator from Ohio—I was not identified, but I was the person in contemplation—believed he had achieved something by having the amount reduced from \$20 million to \$10 million. I was astounded by the remarks which were made. To those 30 people, the statement was made: "The Senate will approve \$10 million. The House approved \$20 million. He might as well understand now that the amount which will be agreed upon in conference will be \$15 million." I repeat: That statement was made in the presence of, I should say, 30 Representatives, and was directed at me, because I made a fight against the bill.

Mr. President, the aquarium bill is nothing but a political operation. Why should a \$15 million aquarium be built in Washington merely to invite visitors, of whom 8 million are already coming into the city each year? To build such an aquarium would be imprudent. It is unjustified. It is an insult to the people of the country, who are struggling to pay taxes. If ever a measure came before this body as to which the President ought to put thumbs down, this is it.

We are worrying over the flight of gold, worrying about lifting the debt ceiling, worrying about the depreciation of the dollar. Yet this scandalous bill is presented to us, a bill which contemplates the building of this aquarium at an expenditure of \$15 million.

Mr. President, I hold the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] in the highest esteem, and I know he is not at all familiar with what transpired at the meeting referred to. He is a decent, honest man; and I know he honestly believes in the legitimacy of this project.

Mr. MORSE. Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has a parliamentary responsibility, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, once this bill has been made the business of the Senate, to take the bill through the Senate. That is his job.

I join the Senator from Ohio in paying the highest respects to the ideals and the high principles of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Certainly he would not be a party to a subterfuge.

Independent Timberman's Committee, Izaak Walton League of America, the Mountaineers, National Audubon Society, National Council of State Garden Clubs, National Grange, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy, Obsidians, President's Quetico-Superior Committee, Sierra Club, Trustees for Conservation, the Wilderness Society, Wildlife Management Institute, and many others, as well as many, many individuals.

Now compare these groups with those names placed in the record by the chairman. Which organizations stand to profit directly from the measures just mentioned?

The chairman made much of 15 amendments offered in the living wilderness, which were never brought before the subcommittee or the full committee. What the chairman did not tell the House was why they were not brought forward. First, the subcommittee reported out a bill so different from the original in major purpose and design, that most outside organizations saw its contents for the first time. The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources issued a release on August 16, 1962, 1 week after the subcommittee's report, entitled "Amendments for Substitute Wilderness Bill Advocated." A copy of this release, the comments at that time by the chairman and vice chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, and the proposed amendments will be found hereafter as a part of my extension of remarks.

One week, Mr. Speaker, after the subcommittee brought forth a bill—that was never before the subcommittee at the time of the public hearings—all members of the committee received copies of these proposed amendments. Were it the desire of the chairman to consider them, he was at liberty to do so.

The proponents of the Aspinall amendment insisted on complete secrecy during the deliberations of the subcommittee in executive session, and those of us favoring the original bill were precluded from discussing the matter with the outside proponents.

The 15 amendments were not brought before the full committee by myself for two reasons: First, the amendments, in substance, restored the original bill, which the subcommittee had just amended; second, the vote by which the Aspinall amendment passed indicated the outcome, and I did not want any further excuses for delay.

The chairman, in his effort to commend the diligence of the committee, found the going difficult to explain why public hearings were not scheduled until May 7 on a measure passed by the Senate on September 6, 1961. In addition, field hearings were held by the committee prior to the convening of the 2d ses-

sion of the 87th Congress. No delay for other reports were necessary prior to scheduling hearings, yet such hearings were delayed from January 10 until May 7—almost 4 months.

No, Mr. Speaker, the chairman's explanation of the House Interior Committee action just would not wash. The failure to bring the wilderness bill to the floor for full consideration is the responsibility of the committee leadership. Their refusal is due to the fear, that when the House has the opportunity to work its will, the result will not be of their choosing.

Cuba
CONGRESS BACKS PRESIDENT'S WARNING TO COMMUNIST-DOMINATED CUBA, AND ITS MASTER, THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the betrayal of the Cuban revolution, and the transformation of Cuba into a Communist fortress and as a base for subversion and aggression against the countries of North, Central, and South America, is a threat that worries the American people.

If Khrushchev gets away with this, he will have scored a major psychological victory in the eyes of the world, and will be in a position to exert stronger pressures against the United States and all the other nations of the New World. By moving in Communist military forces that are cynically described as technicians, he is demonstrating his contempt for our lack of resolution, and is extending his initiative in the cold war. If he succeeds in consolidating his takeover of Cuba under the guise of "military assistance" he will be emboldened to miscalculate our weak and confused response as evidence that we will not stand up to him in Berlin or in other crucial areas of the world.

To avoid miscalculation that could lead to war, he must be served notice that he can go so far, but no further, in Cuba. The House of Representatives, in co-operation with the Senate, will pass a concurrent resolution in support of our President, to prove the unity of our Nation in opposition to this encroachment.

I speak for House Congressional Resolution 538, which I have submitted for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, aware that it reflects the purpose and meaning of many similar resolutions in the Congress to support the President in meeting this issue.

From the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, through the Rio Treaty of 1947, to the declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in 1962, we have progressed from a national to a hemispheric

program to defend the Americas against any attempt on the part of extracontinental powers to extend their system to any of the American States, because we believe such attempts to be dangerous to our peace and safety. We prefer to meet such threats only in consultation and agreement with the 21 Latin American Republics, and consistent with article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations which recognizes the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense.

But if the Communist military build-up in Cuba should threaten the United States or any Latin American Republic, and if the Organization of American States should fail to take effective counteraction, the United States must be prepared to eliminate this menace to our security and our freedoms. We shall, under these circumstances, and as President Kennedy says, use whatever force is required to defeat or overthrow Castro, the tool of Communist imperialism. The resolution follows:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States is supported in his determination and possesses all necessary authority—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or threat of force;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo, free passage to the Panama Canal, U.S. missile and space preparations or the security of this Nation and its citizens; and

(c) to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere and with freedom-loving Cuban refugees to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS OF THE 2D SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and to include a table.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may be interested, I include a down-to-date résumé of the appropriation bills of the session processed through the Committee on Appropriations. Only the customary closing supplemental bill remains to be reported to the House.

The tabulation discloses the current status of each bill.

We should note that permanent appropriations which recur without annual action by the Congress are not included. And in this session, back-door appropriation bills have diminished substantially as compared to last year.

people and thus create the skills for a better industrial and farm economy.

5. At times the generals may be a moderating power, preventing national chaos and for a time producing surface stability. But military dictatorships offer no durable solution to social problems and unwittingly prepare the ground for the advent of communism, by conditioning the public to accept repressions.

This latter point is well expounded by Salvador de Madariaga, Spanish historian and philosopher, in his new book, "Latin America Between the Eagle and the Bear," in which he says:

"The dictator and his country's Communist Party collaborate in opposition to grind out of existence the middle-way parties.

"The longer the dictator lasts, the stronger grows the Communist Party of his country and the brighter its chances of success when the dictator falls.

"The ease with which Castro veered from a revolution which he presented as democratic to one the Communist character of which is now undeniable was due to the long apprenticeship in totalitarianism inflicted on the Cuban people by Batista."

Most of the participants at the Salvador conference, including influential political and intellectual Latin American leaders, privately approved the U.S. action in suspending economic aid to the junta in Peru. Further, the seminar which dealt with the role of the military, put this conclusion on the record: "The United States must understand, and Latin American countries realize, that to continue to support military development is contrary to each nation's welfare."

Diplomatic relations with a military regime is one thing. But making a military dictatorship a working partner with the Alliance for Progress is like trying to make a creek run uphill and is paving the way for communism.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Aug. 19, 1962]

**FRANTIC IMMOBILITY GRIPS BRAZIL—
GOULART VERSUS CONGRESS
(By Roscoe Drummond)**

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Brazil is a grim example of the difficulty this country's fragile democracy has in putting its roots down in the quicksand of economic distress.

A newspaper correspondent, recently returned from Spain, put it graphically: "In Madrid you can't get away from the government and in Rio de Janeiro you can't find the government."

The reason is that right now Brazil is politically a swirling vacuum. Its leaders, its political parties, its makeshift presidency, and its expiring Congress are ominously chasing each other in circles.

The result: Frantic immobility. The Brazilian "government" is nearly invisible because it isn't governing.

President João Goulart isn't governing because he's devoting himself to a campaign to recapture the powers that were taken from him as the only condition under which the military would allow him to become President after Quadros resigned a year ago.

The Brazilian Congress isn't governing because it is at the tail end of its term. It refuses to cooperate with the Goulart government which it distrusts or to yield the powers it fears he will abuse.

This means that Brazil is at a perilous stalemate at a time when its economy is going down and inflation is going up.

How did this mess come about?

Well, in Brazil vice presidential candidates run separately from presidential candidates and the candidate with the highest vote, however small, wins. Goulart got about one-

third of the total vote. His election was roughly what it would be like if Senator WAYNE MORSE, running against LYNDON B. JOHNSON on a Kennedy-reactionary ticket, became Mr. Kennedy's Vice President. Then how would the U.S. Congress like it if Mr. Kennedy resigned and MORSE became President?

Thus Goulart was a minority vice president whom the military reluctantly accepted as Quadros' successor rather than violate the constitution. They accepted only after Congress hastily created a parliamentary form of government.

On the surface Goulart acquiesced in his diminished role but soon proclaimed he wasn't going to stand still long and function "like the Queen of England."

He has been devoting every waking moment to making it impossible for the new parliamentary system to work. It is evident he doesn't want it to work.

Goulart has been so busy arguing that he hasn't sufficient powers to govern, that he has neglected to use the large powers he still possesses to deal seriously with the nation's economic, financial, and social problems.

What we are witnessing is a cold war conducted by an aspiring President against an expiring Congress.

Goulart has been demanding that Congress give him exceptional powers for 6 months and an early plebiscite. From this plebiscite he expects to get popular support to compel Congress to restore his powers.

Congress doesn't want a plebiscite until after the congressional elections in October and isn't disposed to give blank-check powers to a President it doesn't trust.

Thus Brazil's political picture comes full-circle back to its swirling vacuum. Everything's in motion and getting nowhere—unless it be nearer combustion. Combustion can't be ruled out since the menace of a general strike is now threatened unless Congress yields to Goulart. The unions are pretty much in the pocket of Goulart, who was a longtime secretary of labor.

Goulart is trying to make a scapegoat out of Congress for whatever goes wrong and Congress is trying to make a scapegoat out of Goulart.

Until the new elections this fall, the least bad thing that can happen here is nothing.

(Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MILLIKEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CURTIS of Missouri's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

STANDBY AUTHORITY TO PRESIDENT TO CALL UP RESERVISTS

(Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MILLIKEN) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, due to a commitment made some months ago, I regret that I find it impossible to be present for the vote Monday, September 24, on Senate Joint Resolution 224, to give standby authority to the President to call up 150,000 reservists. However, I should like to add my support to the bipartisan effort to give the President the power to act if an emergency should arise when the Congress is not in session. This resolution should be another reminder to those hostile to us that we

are united, and are determined to protect our interests, and that the President will be fully supported in the actions he takes as our Commander in Chief.

WILDERNESS BILL

(Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. MILLIKEN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs addressed the House on why there would be no wilderness bill this year. His comments were not reflective of the chairman I have come to know over this last decade. Usually the chairman candidly states the actions he has taken, the reason for them, and above all takes the responsibility for them whether this means accolade or criticism. Alas, I cannot so construe his remarks of yesterday. The chairman has sought to blame almost everyone who supports a wilderness bill, with appropriate safeguards, for the failure of this Congress to consider the measure.

If the gentleman from Colorado is still interested in obtaining a wilderness bill, he has it in his power to do so. The contention that, if the bill should come to the floor of the House the debate would be too emotional, appears ludicrous. In other words, the committee chairman, who made much of the prerogatives of his committee, is now contending that the House is not competent or should be protected from making decisions in which emotions might be involved. If this becomes precedent, the House floor action will be relegated a very narrow role in the future.

Mr. Speaker, no one is being kidded by this extensive apology by the chairman for the action of the committee—for it was an apology. Everyone knows the real reason for avoiding full House consideration. The proponents of the Aspinall amendment do not have the votes of the full House to pass the measure without serious modification.

The obvious prejudice of the chairman in mentioning all the outside groups supporting the original wilderness bill, before the committee amendment, as lobbyists, and those supporting the amendment as responsible citizens and organizations can be judged by the House itself. Here is a partial list of some of the organizations supporting S. 174, similar to the original H.R. 776:

AFL-CIO, Adirondack Mountain Club, American Bowhunters Association, American Nature Association, American Planning & Civic Association, American Society of Mammalogists, American White Water Affiliation, American Youth Hostels, Appalachian Mountain Club, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Council of Conservationists, Defenders of Wildlife, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Friends of the Wilderness, Garden Club of America, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association,